

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
AIKEN DIVISION

Anthony Q. Robinson,)	Civil Action No.: 1:14-cv-760-RBH
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
Nikon Morgan,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

Plaintiff Anthony Q. Robinson (“Plaintiff”), proceeding *pro se*, originally filed this action in the Court of Common Pleas for Greenville County, South Carolina. *See* Complaint, ECF No. 1-1. Defendant removed the action to this Court on March 6, 2014. *See* Notice of Removal, ECF No. 1. On June 4, 2014, Defendant filed a motion for summary judgment. *See* Mot., ECF No. 29. Plaintiff timely filed a response to Defendant’s motion on June 18, 2014. *See* Pl.’s Resp., ECF No. 33. Defendant then filed a reply in support of the motion on June 30, 2014. *See* Reply, ECF No. 34. The matter is now before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“R & R”) of United States Magistrate Judge Shiva V. Hodges, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina. *See* R & R, ECF No. 37. In the R & R, the Magistrate Judge recommends the Court grant Defendant’s motion for summary judgment. *See id.* at 5.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this Court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the

recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

No party has filed objections to the Report and Recommendation. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendations. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

After a thorough review of the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is adopted and incorporated by reference. Therefore, it is **ORDERED** that Defendant’s motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED** and this action is **DISMISSED** *with prejudice*.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ R. Bryan Harwell
R. Bryan Harwell
United States District Judge

Florence, South Carolina
November 10, 2014